

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 4-22 are currently withdrawn.

In the Office Action dated September 27, 2007, the Examiner claims rejected 1-3 and objected to claim 3 and the drawings.

With this Amendment, claims 1 and 3 were amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments. Accordingly, claims 1-3 are at issue.

**I. Objection To Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5), indicating that they do not include the following reference sign mentioned in the description: #5 - tray housing [Specification, Page 11, Line 19 and following].

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d), enclosed is a copy of Figure 1 showing the changes thereto for which approval of the Examiner is requested. The changes are to correct the drawing and do not constitute new matter. In particular, Figure 1 has been amended to include the number 5 to indicate the location of a tray housing. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

**II. Objection To Claims**

Claim 3 was objected to because of a typographical error in the first line. The error is corrected. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

**III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomioka et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,517,199 B1) in view of Schut, (U.S. Patent No. 6,281,269 B1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 1 requires that the claimed liquid composition have a hydrophobic colloid effective to adhere to a surface in contact with the liquid composition, thereby to prevent elution of silicon or a silicon compound with the liquid composition. The prior art teaches nothing in this regard.

Tomioka et al. teaches a liquid composition that is characterized by its charge. Tomioka et al., Col. 9, lines 44-47. Additionally, the liquid composition also includes either cationic fine particles and an acid or anionic fine particles and a base. Tomioka et al., Col. 10, lines 61-65; Col. 11, lines 63 - Col. 12, line 1; Col. 14, lines 41-45; Col. 15, lines 32-39. Tomioka et al., however, does not teach or even fairly suggest a hydrophobic component separate and apart from any pigment as reflected in amended claim 1. *See* Col. 9, line 44 - Col. 16, line 14. In fact, Tomioka et al., specifically teaches a reduction in corrosion based on the pH of the liquid composition, rather than a hydrophobic component. Col. 10, lines 55 - 58; Col. 14, lines 35-38.

Tomioka et al. does teach that a *pigment* can include either a hydrophilic group or hydrophobic group. Tomioka et al., Col. 17, line 20 - Col. 18, line 26, Col. 20, line 55- Col. 22, line 53. However, Tomioka et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest that such a characteristic is required, nor does Tomioka et al. teach or even fairly suggest that a pigment with a hydrophobic group will effectively prevent elution of silicon or silicon compounds from a surface in contact with the liquid composition into the liquid composition. Tomioka et al., Col. 17, line 20 - Col. 18, line 26, Col. 20, line 55- Col. 22, line 53.

Schut teaches a reactant fluid. Schut, Col. 1, lines 34-58. However, Schut does not teach or even fairly suggest that the reactant fluid contains a hydrophobic component. Schut, Col. 1, lines 34-58.

Therefore, in any combination of the cited references, they do not teach or fairly suggest a liquid composition as reflected in amended claim 1. At best, the cited art might suggest a liquid characterized by its polar charge, with either anionic particles and a base, or cationic particles and an acid and a pH range from 3 to 6, rather than 4 to 6. However, clearly, the cited art does not teach or even fairly suggest a liquid composition with a separate hydrophobic component, much less that a hydrophobic component would effectively prevent elution of silicon and silicon compounds. As such, claim 1 is patentable over Tomioka et al. in view of Schut, taken singularly or in combination with each other, as are dependent claims 2 and 3 for the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 27, 2007

By: /David R. Metzger/  
David R. Metzger  
Registration No. 32,919  
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000